UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,399	12/05/2001	David E. Petersen	120362(624226-322)	9413

29391	7590	02/18/2004	

BEUSSE BROWNLEE WOLTER MORA & MAIRE, P. A.
390 NORTH ORANGE AVENUE
SUITE 2500
ORLANDO, FL 32801

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, HUNG·T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2636	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/005,399	PETERSEN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Hung T. Nguyen	2636

All Participants:

(1) *Hung T. Nguyen*.

(2) *David Maire*.

Status of Application: *Non Final Rejection*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *17 February 2003*   **Time:** *10:00 AM*

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☒ No
   If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
3 & 10-12

Prior art documents discussed:
Orscheck (U.S. 5,394,137) & Hosaka et al. (U.S. 4,962,570)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
Applicant will submit arguments in the Amendment to clarify the claimed invention .

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)